Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No. 10/705,700	Applicant(s) SORDJAN, SIMEON
	Examiner Jordan M. Schwartz	Art Unit 2873

All Participants:

(1) _Jordan M. Schwartz_.

(2) _Jennifer Meredith_.

Status of Application: _____

(3) _____.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: _20 December 2004_

Time: _____

Type of Interview:

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant   ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes   ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: .

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

_1, 3-5, 8, 10, 15-16, 19-21, 24-26_

Prior art documents discussed:

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

_____
(Examiner/SPE Signature)

_____
(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The changes to the claims were discussed and agreed upon to provide additional clarity as to applicant's intended meaning and to overcome potential rejections concerning flip-up lenses (overcoming in terms of the claimed "in a fixed position". The abstract was amended as discussed because it was too long and therefore not in compliance with the MPEP. .